

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

April 12, 2007

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dennis Cope, Robert Hall, Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Senior Planner; Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Lori Peckol; Planning Policy Manager

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:00 PM. Design Review Board members Mery Velastegui and David Wobker were excused.

MINUTES

February 15, 2007

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 15, 2007 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED (3-0-2), WITH MR. HALL AND MR. COPE ABSTAINING.

DISCUSSION ITEM

**L070097, Draft Proposed Design Standards for Overlake Village,
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update**

Description: Seeking Design Review Board input on draft design standards prior to beginning Planning Commission review in May.

Staff Contact: Lori Peckol / 425.556.2411

Lori Peckol, Planning Policy Manager, presented the staff report, giving the objectives of the project and explaining that staff was seeking the advice of the Design Review Board on draft updates and design standards staff is considering for the Overlake Plan, which needs to be updated to account for the relocation of Group Health out of the area, to include Sound Transit's planning for extension of light rail, to extend the time horizon up to 2030, and most importantly to put in place a strategy to implement the plan. The outcomes would be updated policies, zoning, additional design standards, an actual master plan, an implementation strategy, and subsequent to these, updates to the City's functional plans, such as the Transportation Master Plan and the Parks and Recreation Plan, to add the projects proposed and put in place the funding to achieve those. She explained the plans for Overlake Village, which would include the following topics: surface and underground parking, parking garage design, building form and scale with potential for increased heights up to ten stories, building materials, ground floor retail and other commercial facades, and pedestrian plazas and open spaces. The vision for 152nd Avenue NE is a lively retail street with ground floor retail and houses above. Staff wanted to know what character the DRB members preferred: a main street with plazas for the breaks or additional separations of the upper stories. Another design standard for DRB consideration was articulation.

Mr. Hall requested the chance to read and digest the design standards, then return to a future meeting with some in-depth commentary. There was agreement with this proposal.

APPROVAL

L070132, Kohl's Department Store

Description: Commercial addition of the existing Mervyn's Store includes partial second floor 17,626 square feet, other interior modifications and exterior façade modifications. Structural and non-bearing interior wall, two entrances and storefront windows.

Location: 17601 Union Hill Road

Applicant Request: Approval

Staff Recommendation: Approval

Applicant: Jeff Adam with Kohl's Department Store

Staff Contact: Nathalie Schmidt / 425.556.2471

Steve Fischer, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. Staff is recommending conditional approval of the building elevations, materials and landscaping with the standard Presentation Materials Inconsistencies condition. This project was previously reviewed by the DRB in October 2006 and is the remodel of the old Mervyn's building. The proposal is to raise a quarter of the roof about 10 feet to accommodate a second level for storage and offices. The exterior would be completely repainted and the two storefront entrances would be redesigned. Existing site, loading area, parking lot, access and landscaping will not be changed except for repaving the parking lot and replacing failed vegetation.

Jeff Stowe, 244 N. Broadway, Milwaukee, WI 53201, presented for the applicant. He showed the elevations, materials, and placement of the materials. They are proposing to keep the overall footprint of the building and are reconfiguring the two entrances. He explained that they would be coating the painted CMU building with a spray-on, heavy-duty coating system.

David DeVos, Director of Architecture for Kohl's, was also present for the applicant.

Brian Feeney, WRG Design, 5415 SW Westgate Drive, Portland, OR 97221, explained that they would be overlaying the parking lot, restriping it, and fixing any damaged landscaping. On the rear and sides of the building, they would be adding some trees and shrubbery along the highway side and the parking lot. They would be replacing the sidewalk and improving drainage by adding gravel to the catch basin.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- Confirmed there was no employee entrance or employee rest area outside. He requested that at least a bench be added.

Mr. Cope:

- Thought they had listened and appreciated the gestures made in response to DRB comments.
- Liked the idea of a break area for staff.

Mr. Meade:

- Liked the proposal for the most part.
- Liked the entry.
- Was not crazy about the coating system. Did not see the advantage of coating the entire building with one color. Thought there was some detailing on the original building that was worth salvaging. Was not in favor of that part of the proposal.
- Suggested updating some of the color tiles to go with the color scheme.

Mr. Hall:

- Commented that he had no concerns.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Confirmed that the parking lot had existing irrigation, but assumed it would be tested and updated. (The applicant assured the DRB members that the contractor would make sure the existing system works and would be irrigating a few new areas.)

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE L070132, KOHL'S DEPARTMENT STORE, BASED ON THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES**
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11" x 17" submittal drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement.
- 2. MUST USE THE BOARDS AND COLORS PRESENTED AT THIS MEETING BY THE APPLICANT.**
- 3. MUST BE A PLACE FOR A BREAK AREA FOR EMPLOYEES ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE BUILDING.**

MOTION CARRIED (4-1), WITH MR. MEADE VOTING AGAINST THE MOTION.

APPROVAL

L070099, Mondovio Lot 71

Description: Construction of 33 buildings with 108 housing units consisting of a combination of 5-unit townhomes, duplexes, and 5-unit row houses

Location: 425 Pontius Avenue North

Applicant Request: Approval

Staff Recommendation: Approval

Architect: Ginger Garff with Weber+Thompson

Landscape Architect: Mark Tilbe with The Dwelling Company

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer / 425.556.2432

Steve Fischer, Senior Planner, presented the staff report on this Planned Residential Development, Site Plan Entitlement, last seen in January 2007 as a pre-application. Staff recommendation is to approve the project with conditions.

Catherine Benotte, with Weber+Thompson, 425 Pontius Ave N #200, Seattle, 98109, gave an overview of the broader goals and reasoning beyond the arrangement of the elements in the site plan. They took the opportunity to address Red-Wood Road more formally. They wanted to address the wetland and buffer areas and the openness of the site. They wanted the development to face neighbors. She showed an aerial photo of the site context and showed the strong urban edge of the buildings facing the street. There is a formal urban view approaching the site. The existing topography gives almost an amphitheater effect as it slopes down on a diagonal across the site. The buildings would be arranged in line with the topography and are benched down with that amphitheater effect going through so there are tuck-under buildings that use the land very efficiently. The row houses have very large porches that overlook the wetland. They have a gathering space near the adjacent neighborhood so it would not be an insular part of the project. The buildings shape and frame the streets. There is a linear green that would run along Red-Wood Road with a meandering pathway. They are keeping the facades that face the streets and the public pedestrian areas free of garages, which are on alleys. They have strengthened the pedestrian connections and wayfinding mechanisms. They will soften the surface by scoring the concrete and will have structural turf growing up through the grids. As both a traffic-calming measure and another way for people to approach the site, it would be good for guests to be able to park on 156th Avenue NE.

Rick Vanderheide, landscape architect, 200 E Boston Street, Seattle, 98104, explained that there would be a great variety of plant material and a guiding principle would be the wetland. They would be using certain trees to identify pedestrian connections through the site and certain trees at the entrance to another area, which would be predominately evergreen materials. They are engaging the wetland by providing a seating area and an overlook at the edge of the wetland. There would also be a pedestrian access and a bridge leading to the lookout area. In the commons area, there would be a stone seating wall and other stone features in a circle to provide a gathering place. There would be a linear green

space along the frontage of Red-Wood Road that would have plantings in front of all the residences and private pedestrian sidewalks. He showed the pedestrian path plan and the landscape lighting plan, which would include traditional street lights and bollard-style lighting through the pedestrian ways.

Kristen Scott, Weber + Thompson, 425 Pontius Ave N #200, Seattle, 98109, spoke about the building architecture. She noted that they had incorporated the suggestions from the last DRB review. There would be transitions between the public and private spaces, and everything would work together to form a cohesive identity. The architecture would be a social backdrop for the interactions between neighbors. The residences would be traditional Northwest Craftsman style and incorporate four-sided architecture. They would use natural wood stain shingles on every building. There would be generous overhangs. Every home would have large stoops, porches, or upper-level decks. The color theme was inspired by the Sammamish Indians and water.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Hall:

- Noted that this is still the same site plan as the last and has all guest parking at the center of the site. If the structural grass street is used frequently, the grass may or may not grow there. The park is in one area that benefits only about 13 homes. There should be a more central open space, and the guest parking should be relocated. He did not support the site plan because there needs to be a village green.
- Liked what they had done to the buildings.

Mr. Madrid:

- Noted that the main entrance to the community was not obvious and wanted to know if there would be a landmark or signage that would establish the entrance to the community. (The applicant responded that they usually do not do that although there is space available.) He noted that interesting landscape at the entrance would then be important.
- Appreciated the overlook to the wetlands.
- Noted that the fencing along the overlook was split-rail fencing along the sides and on the front was metal vertical fencing. Having two fence types seemed like a dichotomy to him. He preferred the wooden fences. Thought the metal fencing seemed out of place near the lush wetlands.
- Noted the need to do something for the trash receptacles. (The applicant responded that the trash receptacles would be kept in the garage and moved to the curb for individual pickup.)
- Liked the color palette except for some of the door colors, particularly the robin's egg blue and red orange, which he could not support. Suggested toning down to a brick red.
- Thought the common space in terms of the master plan was lacking. He knew they had tried to do something with the bottom space. Thought the plan lacked common space. He did not see anything central that would draw people to be a community as a whole.
- Noted that the trees around the common space are different on the renderings and the plans.
- Thought the playground should include a play structure—not necessarily a pre-built play structure.
- Did not know why a fence would be required on the front part. (Mr. Fischer explained that the front fence was not there for safety reasons but for noise buffering from the street, which is a state highway. The fence would be a stained natural cedar.)
- Agreed that parking is an issue. Thought it would be helpful to have parking on 156th Avenue NE if possible.
- Commented that the lighting is good.
- Confirmed that every front door has lighting.
- Thought the building architecture had been improved.
- Thought Options 1 and 2 were reasonable for the houses if he had to choose among the options.
- Did not care for the site plan in general.

Mr. Cope:

- Thought the presentation and documentation were very articulate and well-prepared.
- Inquired about addressing stormwater. (Mr. Fischer explained that the stormwater provisions were stopped at 156th Avenue NE to take all the water down to the valley floor.) Mr. Cope suggested that some go overland for evaporation.
- Believed this was the most pedestrian and human scale strategy for the site.

- Understood the need for a fence, but did not see where the fence was designed. Would request in the motion that the fence design be submitted.
- Liked the colors and supported them. Thought a bright front door makes a good community. The door is the easiest thing to paint and a way to individualize a place.
- Said that if he had one of the duplexes overlooking the wetland, he would like a porch to wrap around those two units. (The applicant explained that would not be possible because they were right up to the buffer.)
- Understood the dilemma about parking. Knew what creates an urban neighborhood and what creates an automobile-focused neighborhood. Understood the issues and supported the solution.
- Inquired how wide the five-unit townhouse buildings were. (The applicant responded that there were three 16-foot and two 18-foot. The distance between them was about 18 feet, and the building code required a minimum of 10 feet.
- Agreed with staff's point in the third staff recommendation regarding Options 1 and 2.
- Would like something to come back on the fences.
- Would like something that designates the entry to the neighborhood.
- Agreed with the idea of toddler-friendly play equipment.
- Liked the project and could support it.
- Thought they had done a good job on this presentation.

Mr. Meade:

- Said he had nothing to add.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Confirmed that all units had two-car garages.
- Had never used grass pave where it would be driven on all the time. (The applicant had seen many examples.)
- Considered the landscape plan to be a little too conceptual. Would like to see it when further delineated. (There was agreement that Ms. Promer-Nichols should see it after the approval.)
- Liked Options 1 and 2; thought the buildings and colors looked nice.
- Wanted trees on the inner lane.

Staff would find out if 156th Avenue NE is available for parking.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO APPROVE MONDOVIO LOT 71, L070099, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. SIDEWALKS SHOULD BE DIFFERENTIATED FROM THE VEHICULAR PATHS BY TEXTURING, COLOR, OR USE OF A DIFFERENT MATERIAL. THIS IS ESPECIALLY NECESSARY FOR THE SIDEWALKS RUNNING ALONG THE GARAGE DRIVEWAYS, AND WHERE PEDESTRIAN PATHS CROSS VEHICULAR PATHS. [RCDG 20D40.45-040(2)(f)]**
- 2. THE LIGHTING PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE. THE LIGHTING FIXTURE CUT SHEETS SHALL BE PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE CITY OF REDMOND FOR REVIEW, WITH STAFF PRIMARILY LOOKING AT FOOTCANDLE SUFFICIENCY FOR SAFETY. [20D.40.25-060 Site Lighting]**
- 3. THE 5-UNIT TOWNHOUSE DESIGN OPTIONS 1 AND 2 AS SUBMITTED SHALL BE APPROVED. BOTH OF THESE TWO OPTIONS SHALL BE USED ALONG REDMOND-WOODINVILLE ROAD AS DEPICTED ON PAGE 7 OF THE SUBMITTAL.**
- 4. PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES**
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11" x 17" submittal drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will

review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement.

- 5. PROVIDE SOME DISTINGUISHING LANDMARK AT THE ENTRANCE TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD, WHETHER LANDMARK SIGN OR LANDSCAPING.**
- 6. DETAILED LANDSCAPE PLAN MUST BE SUBMITTED TO MS. PROMER-NICHOLS FOR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**
- 7. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHOULD REINVESTIGATE THE FENCING AT THE OVERLOOK AND MAKE IT MORE APPROPRIATE FOR THE AREA AND MORE CREATIVE.**
- 8. A DETAILED FENCE ELEVATION WILL BE PART OF THE LANDSCAPE PLAN SUBMITTAL. THE FENCE NEEDS TO BE DESIGNED CORRECTLY.**
- 9. THE APPLICANT SHOULD INVESTIGATE WITH STAFF A SUITABLE PLAY STRUCTURE FOR CHILDREN IN THE COMMON OPEN SPACE AREA.**

THE MOTION CARRIED (3-2), WITH MR. HALL AND MR. MEADE NOT IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION.

APPROVAL

L070092, Tudor Manor

Description: Development of nine townhouse units in two buildings

Location: 8385 166th Ave NE

Applicant Request: Approval of site entitlement application

Staff Recommendation: Approval

Applicant: Matt Driscoll with Driscoll Architects

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report, explaining that the project has been enhanced. Staff recommends approval with only one condition other than the standard materials inconsistencies condition and that is the applicant must provide the details for the lighting fixtures to the City for review with the construction documents. The Front Yard Setback being less than 20 feet as shown in the plans presented is the only deviation. He noted that the materials for the top floor of the west elevation were not listed in the siding materials and requested that the applicant go over that in the presentation.

Matt Driscoll, 115 Bell Street, Seattle, WA 98121, described the project. They are introducing solar collectors for heat and hot water, each unit has a garage accessed off the central courtyard, and some units have pedestrian access off the courtyard and some directly off the street. They have taken away the stone. For materials, they are using those traditional for a Tudor project—stucco, horizontal siding, and brick. The proposed colors are somewhat muted. The bricks would be darker, charred-colored clinkers that they would like to intersperse with some white w/black clinkers. The stucco would be in two colors, one on each building with the same color trim to tie the buildings together.

Robert Pantley, 5740 127th Ave NE, Kirkland, WA 98033, explained that they are trying to blend in a 60s look with something more timeless.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Pointed out that the columns should have brick, but the L101 plan showed stucco.
- Wanted to know if the applicant had considered using porous concrete. (Mr. Pantley confirmed that Public Works Stormwater was going to let him use this as a test case on some patios, but not the driveway because in a wellhead.)
- Preferred a darker garage door color than that shown on page 6. The DRB members all preferred a darker garage door color.

Mr. Cope:

- Requested that sheet A201 be clarified regarding an 18-inch brick return being over the entryway where the brick meets the horizontal siding.

Mr. Madrid:

- Confirmed that there would be individual trash receptacles in the garage.

Mr. Hall:

- Liked the design; thought it charming.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Liked the design.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE L070092, TUDOR MANOR, SITE PLAN, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, LANDSCAPE PLANTING MATERIALS, AND COLORS WITH CONDITIONS:

1. THE LIGHTING PLAN IS SUBJECT OF THE APPROVAL OF PLANNING STAFF. THE LIGHTING FIXTURE CUT SHEETS SHALL BE PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE CITY OF REDMOND FOR REVIEW WITH THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS.
2. THE FOLLOWING DEVIATION FROM RCDG 20C.40.40-03 ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN FLEXIBILITY: FRONT YARD SETBACK LESS THAN 20 FEET AS SHOWN IN THE PLANS PRESENTED.
3. PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11" x 17" submittal drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement.
4. THE GARAGE DOORS MUST TAKE A DARKER COLOR THAN IS SHOWN. STAFF CAN APPROVE THIS.
5. SHOW ON THE PLANS THAT THERE IS A BRICK RETURN ABOVE THE ENTRY ON THE EAST ELEVATION FACING 166TH AVENUE NE.

MOTION CARRIED (5-0).

MEETING CLOSURE

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY MR. MADRID TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 10 PM. MOTION CARRIED (5-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE070025, Hopelink

Description: Demo (2) four-unit buildings, Construct (2) buildings with (14 units of transitional housing)

Location: 9441 Avondale Road

Applicant: Ben Pascal with The Dwelling Company

Staff Contact: Nathalie Schmidt / 425.556.2471

Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Mr. Fischer explained that the Technical Committee would make the call on the parking spaces prior to Design Review Board approval.

Ginger Garff, Weber + Thompson, reported that a traffic study determined that the actual need for this project would be parking for twelve cars. She walked through the site plan, stating that the main goal is to keep the architecture simple yet provide richness for the residents. There would be a tot lot that is fully fenced. The property is required to be fenced. The floor plans are fairly traditional townhouse plans. They tried to provide strong pedestrian level detailed base to the buildings.

Jan Dickerman, Director of Housing for Hopelink, explained that this is a 14-unit project for homeless families that is being done pro bono through a partnership with The Dwelling Company.

- Jason Morris, landscape architect, said that the plan is to create an understory, a planting concept that augments the developed overstory of mixed conifers and second-growth Douglas firs, and to serve the functional needs of the site. There would be no lawn on the site to keep maintenance low. They will have plantings that attract butterflies and wildlife. He confirmed that the play area was still under development, but there would be a table and chairs there.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- Inquired if the pedestrian paths would be concrete pavers. (The applicant responded that they would probably be cast in place.)
- Was supportive of the project.
- Thought the elevations were nice, particularly the use of the arbors.
- Confirmed that there would be irrigation, but the applicant was trying to go as drought-resistant as possible.
- Confirmed that the siding material was 12-inch Hardiboard, vertical tongue-in-groove.
- Was supportive of the site plan and thought they had used the site well since there are a lot of common areas.

Mr. Cope:

- Confirmed that the fence could not be a green fence. (Mr. Fischer explained that the fence would be solid for noise attenuation because of the lack of space.)
- Looked forward to seeing the creativity that would go into the fence; liked the idea of a fence because of Avondale to delineate what is public and what is private.
- Did not see any of the units being handicap accessible. (The applicant confirmed that one of the ground floor flats would be handicap accessible, with the option of there being more than one. Ms. Garff said that the plan is designed so it is not a big change to make the units accessible.)
- Liked the architecture; thought it appropriate and quite well detailed.

Mr. Meade:

- Was concerned about the height of the windows on the second floor and would like to see them adjusted.
- Liked everything else but the space between the upper lights and the main windows where the shed roof was located. Thought the space should be larger or the windows ganged together because they looked small and undersized.
- Said he could not wait to see the colors.

Mr. Hall:

- Thought this was a nice design.
- Was supportive of the project.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thought the project was great and was glad to see it happening.
- Thought this was a good location for the proposed project.

(Mr. Hall left at 10:30 PM.)

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE070023, Perrigo Parks Condos

Description: Four-story, 15-unit multi-family structures with first floor for parking and remaining floors for residential

Location: 8310 165th Ave NE

Applicant: Sam Evich with TGB Architects

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani / 425.556.2443

Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report, explaining that the project is a colonial-style residential building with a fenced courtyard. Staff liked that this is a different project for Redmond and a good change. The brick building has a very nice color scheme, tripartite articulation, and modulation in

the form of colors and materials, especially on the street-facing façade. There is a fenced courtyard proposed. She noted that staff has concerns regarding the trash enclosures because they are not shown on the drawings submitted. The applicant has requested design flexibility for a 10-foot setback, and staff supports that. Staff would like the applicant to give some thought to sustainability.

John Fromel, 3010 NE 60th Street, Seattle, WA 98115, commented that they have addressed the trash enclosure issue by putting it inside the parking structure. Waste Management is fine with that.

Brad Butterfield, architect, explained that they have gone more toward a more traditional but modern project than a Tudor. He noted that the client felt it important to have a semi-formal courtyard in front of the building. The applicant proposes to use a see-through fence and landscaping. He noted that they had included some additional information to the original packet. They had made some changes to the back sides of the elevation to get more interest, such as adding more landscaping around the concrete parking structure. He showed some color schemes for lap-siding brick, shingles and painting the concrete. They have emphasized the front entrance as required by code. With the trellis, fence, and gate, they are emphasizing where the front door is located.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Suggested a belly band at the third floor to help with the tripartite look.
- Loved bricks, but considered the brick columns to be a little heavy and needing to be scaled down and the number reduced.
- Thought the height of the fence might be taller than needed. Suggested exploring 4-foot fencing.
- Noted that the south elevation with the middle bay that has brick would be the more prominent elevation. He suggested turning another gable on that and putting in a bay. (Bob Holzhauser explained that particular space was a bedroom so that would eat up windows.)
- Confirmed that the base would be a darker color architectural concrete than appeared on the rendering. Thought they were on the right track.
- Thought that brick detailing would be important.
- Wanted to know if there would be bonding patterns, corbels, other details. (The applicant responded that they would keep it cleaner by trying to make a transition with the brick.)
- Suggested looking at another bonding pattern to give it a little more flavor.
- Inquired how the decks would be supported on the outside corners. (The applicant replied that if they decided to do that they would make it work.)

Mr. Cope:

- Appreciated the additional drawings and photos provided for clarification at this meeting.
- Confirmed that trash is being handled by two containers set into the stairwell area. (The applicant claimed that the City is requiring the trash containers to be inside the parking structure.)
- Would appreciate the applicant noting at the next review any sustainability features incorporated into the architecture or landscape.
- Would like some sort of protection on the top units that would increase the usability of that space and add another interesting thing to the elevations.
- Suggested that the kitchen windows on the north elevation be patterned like the other windows. (The applicant said they could be.)
- Thought the unit plans were dynamite for livability, especially where every unit has two exposures.
- Liked the layout of the floors because they give the maximum privacy for a multi-family dwelling.
- Thought the tree preservation plan on PL 1.1 was a misnomer because they are cutting down all the trees. (The applicant explained that the oak tree is decayed and there must be a sidewalk there that would go right through the existing tree.)
- Thought it a handsome project—a new and refreshing style.
- Liked the allocation of outdoor space.
- Confirmed that the bay windows would be wood.

Mr. Madrid:

- Thought the pillars were oversized.

- Confirmed that the applicant would do some garden lighting in the front area and that any lighting around the building would be sconces mounted on the wall.
- Suggested that the applicant address the color of the base.
- Thought it a smart project.
- Liked the style.
- Liked the way the project was going.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thought there was a lot of salal and that the landscape plan needed some variety and softening in those areas.
- Suggested that the applicant see if there is some way to address the blank wall facing NE 83rd Street in some architectural way to soften the wall; suggested an applied trellis or a brick inset. Commented that the wall of concrete in this neighborhood would look odd and anything to diminish that would be an improvement. But did not want the applicant to rely just on plants.
- Commented that the idea of the courtyard is a great idea, but they need to look at the programming of the space and what it wants to be because that space is not accessed directly by any units. Those spaces could be used, and the applicant would have to activate the space.
- Noted that her favorite elevation is the one with the parking garage.

There was agreement that the applicant was ready to submit for approval.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE070024, Geneve Condominiums

Description: Exterior and landscape upgrade to 78 existing apartment units to be converted to condominiums

Location: 8125 Willows Road

Applicant: Katie Oman with Place Architects, PLLC

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani / 425.556.2443

Asma Jeelani presented the staff report on this project located in the Willows/Rose Hill neighborhood. She explained that the proposal is for interior TI improvements and exterior façade improvements. The addition of 42 carports is also proposed. The new exteriors are intended to be modulated to have a character and not to be monotonous. They propose to use three materials for the elevations, but staff would prefer that they use only one or two. She noted that the applicant had provided a landscape plan at this meeting. The applicant must now provide the carport design and a tree-retention plan.

Rob Downing, 2412 Westlake Ave N #4, Seattle, WA 98109, one of the owners of the project, explained their intention of converting the apartment complex to condominiums. Their design is reflective of a ski resort town, a Sierra Nevada alpine environment with large boulders and alpine trees in the landscape plan.

Heather Johnston, 119 West Denny, Seattle, WA 98119, explained that they are using Hardipanel because that material is durable and sustainable, but are using wide panels and then a recess. The location of the project is on a hill that looks out over Redmond. They are adjacent to Woodinville wine country so that is also a contextual influence. The colors and textures they propose are about creating neighborhood and helping to organize the space of the whole site in a way that makes sense for wayfinding and differentiation. The three materials with a couple of color choices help to create a kind of continuity but also diversity. She noted that sustainability is a considerable part of all their projects. They are using corrugated metal in two colors as an accent. This is used because it has 25- and 50-year warranties and is incredibly low maintenance. There are no coatings or painting.

Katie Oman, 119 W Denny Way, Seattle, WA 98119, commented that there are a couple of problems that they are architecturally trying to solve. The blue siding is being replaced, and the door locations are being accented with canopies. She pointed out the trash enclosure location. The signage matches the base of the buildings with all the stone being consistent throughout.

Jeff Skierka, 21301 SE 242nd Street, Sammamish, WA 98075, reiterated the desire to make this project have a ski resort feel. They have incorporated a lot of aspens into the landscape plan to soften the buildings. They plan to install a lot more trees than they are removing. He had a list of proposed plants to be added and those to be removed. The driveway access will be lighted by having lighted trees as opposed to light fixtures. There is a common area that will have a fire pit and will be set on mortar-set stones. They are moving a lot of overgrown rhododendrons to the perimeter. They are leaving all of the existing conifers and evergreen trees. The 50 trees they are removing are plum, maple and locust trees that do not fit into the theme. These are being replaced with about 130 new ones. He noted that this tree plan was included in the landscape plan. He described the landscape treatment for the common space, which included a rockery and the fire pit.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB BOARD:

Mr. Madrid:

- Confirmed that there would be opportunities for outdoor eating and gathering with outdoor furniture.
- Was supportive of the project; thought it exciting.
- Had some concern about the number of materials. Liked what he saw but was nervous about the number of materials. Liked the corrugated metal, but was not quite sure how that would work. Had not seen that used much.
- Thought the elevations were fairly successful. Would like to see several more renderings of the different elevations.
- Liked the proposed landscaping, which is certainly an upgrade to what is currently there.
- Liked the use of the boulders. Liked the ski lodge theme.
- Inquired if they could landscape around the trash enclosures to make them blend in. (The applicant agreed they could and would show that in the more detailed landscape plan to be submitted.)

Mr. Cope:

- Thought this was a good sustainable design.
- Suggested that they do everything possible to maximize the social opportunity of the mailboxes.
- Thought the trash enclosures needed more study; not substantial enough to last.
- Liked what they had done with wayfinding.
- Was intrigued by the colors and the use of materials. Did not want to discourage them from stepping to the edge, but would like more information for the next review to make sure not garish. A sketch-up model including landscaping would be good.
- Liked that they trying to create a character and a style that is integrated with landscaping.
- Thought this was going in a great direction.

Mr. Meade:

- Confirmed that they are retaining the current roofing material, but preferred they would not.
- Liked the colors and the playfulness.
- Would like to see a heavier transition between the upper siding and the stone bases.
- Inquired about the window trims in the stone. (The applicant thought they would have a lintel sill recessed a little in the stone.)
- Inquired how the board and batten was going to be executed. (The applicant sketched this for him, showing the use of a drop channel.)

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thought it would be interesting to integrate building identification in a special way.
- Thought a barbeque would help to populate the space by the lodge.
- Suggested a few more photographs showing what the landscape looks like and what they are planning to do.
- Urged them, since they are taking out some plants, to take out all the ivy since it is a noxious weed.
- Urged them to do more swaths of grasses.
- Thought it cool that they are updating these very dated apartment complexes.

There was agreement that another pre-application review was unnecessary.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 11:30 PM. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY